

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

**July 18, 2002
1416 Ninth Street
Auditorium – 1st Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Agenda Item 1 -- Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Reiner at 9:25 a.m.

Agenda Item 2 -- Roll Call.

Present were Commissioners Kim Belshé, Elizabeth Rice-Grossman, Louis Vismara, Theresa Garcia, Karen Hill-Scott, Genie Chough and Chairman Reiner.

Agenda Item 3 -- Approval of Minutes, May 16th, 2002 State Commission Meeting

Bullet 1 on page 6 should read “Public Engagement” instead of “Public Education.” Commissioner Vismara stated that the discussion section of item 12 should include more emphasis on “not doing research for research’s sake”.

Action by Commission: Chairman Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Belshé to approve the June 20, 2002 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 4 – Chairman’s Report

Chairman Reiner reported the following:

- In July of 2002 Los Angeles County Commission voted to allocate \$100M towards providing universal health care for all children 0-5. The next vote may be for universal access to preschool. The State Commission applauds the actions of the Los Angeles Commission.
- The local school bond had \$5M set aside for early education facilities. Through the work of the LA Commission the allocation has been raised to \$80M.
- This is Chairman Reiner’s last meeting for 2002.

Agenda Item 5 – Executive Director’s Report

Jane Henderson reported on the following:

- The Advisory Committee on Diversity met last month. The committee focused on two major issues: 1) language and cultural adaptation of the Kit for New Parents; 2) the implementation plan for the Principles on Equity. Based on research the committee concurred on moving forward with the adaptation of aspects of the kits in three additional languages, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese. In the second phase the kit will be further adapted to Cambodian, Hmong and Laotian. Staff has been working hard to incorporate the Principles on Equity since their official adoption in October of 2001. Staff is working on an implementation plan that targets the State Commission and it is hoped that some local commissions adopt the plan as well. A workgroup has been formed to develop the implementation plan. The plan will be presented to the Commission in the Fall.
- Staff and the CCAFA have been discussing next steps for providing technical assistance (TA) for county commissions. The State Commission’s annual statewide conference is scheduled for April 23rd through 25th. CCAFA is continuing to receive funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. Staff is considering the idea of providing funding TA through a regional allocation process then allowing the counties to hire contractors around key topics. The TA subcommittee is continuing to work on defining the regions, designating the fiscal administrative lead county in each region and determining an allocation formula for distributing the funds. Staff has been discussing the figure of \$1M for a 2 year period.
- The Packard Foundation has been working on the development of a guaranteed loan program for the construction of child care facilities. The Foundation is hoping that the State Commission could help with funding. The State Commission can not fund capital projects, but it could consider contributing to TA and training for child care providers.

Agenda Item 6 – California Children and Families Association Report

Sherry Novick reported on the following:

- The most recent Association meeting focused on the state budget and the impact at the county level. Several attorneys were present to discuss the issue of supplantation. There is concern over the increased tobacco tax in the Governor’s budget, which may lead to a greater cigarette black market.
- The Association has formed a Fiscal Issues working group. The Association is well placed to be an advocacy voice. The Packard Foundation has given the Association a grant for developing organizational effectiveness.

- The Association is pleased with the work done with the state staff on TA for local commissions.

Discussion:

Chairman Reiner concurred with the report with respect to what the State Commission should be thinking about concerning local commissions. Proposition 10 funds were not expected to last forever; they were intended to jump-start the funding for these programs.

Brenda Blasingame stated that she had a discussion recently around how the State will move toward building sustainability in light of diminished funding streams.

Chairman Reiner stated that the Commission is working to put in place a sustainable early childhood system. The system should be designed to weather economic hardships.

Agenda Item 7 – Meeting Calendar for 2003

Joe Munso presented this action item.

The calendar was presented to the Commission with one change made to the document. The statewide conference will be held in April and, as such, there will be no Commission meeting in April.

Action by the Commission: The motion to approve passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 8 – School Readiness Initiative: Year in Review

Roberta Peck presented this discussion item. An outline of the presentation follows.

- Why invest in School Readiness?
 - California's children will be healthier and better prepared to reach their greatest potential in school and in life. (CCFC Vision)
- We know investments in early years increase school readiness
 - A child's brain develops very rapidly in the first three years of life; experience plays a significant role in brain structure and function.
 - Early childhood offers the greatest potential return on investment; interventions have demonstrated cost-effectiveness.
 - Brain development and public investment are not yet synchronized.
- Purpose of school readiness programs/systems
 - To coordinate, develop, implement, and sustain a system of collaborative school-based/linked services, programs, and informal supports based on research or promising practices to improve school readiness for children, families, communities, and schools.

- To focus CCFC efforts (four strategic result areas)
- SR Task Force
 - January 2001 – Governor Davis establishes SR Task Force
 - Representatives: Governor’s Office; Secretary for Education, DHHS; DOF; CCFC; 3 county commissions.
 - Meetings in February and March, 2001
 - Contributed to conceptual design
- SR Advisory Committee
 - Convened to broaden participation in SRI
 - Representatives: Educators and Administrators (K-12 and ECE); Legislators; Parent Groups; Advocacy Groups; State Agencies; Local Government; Advisory Committee on Diversity reps.
 - Meetings in March and July, 2001
 - Results: Expand partnership and support for SR; Advice for implementation and technical assistance
- CCFC SR Planning Group
 - Fiscal
 - Program (aka Criteria)
 - Evaluation
 - Technical Assistance
 - Provided ideas and enthusiasm for design of SRI; Broadened County Commission support via CCAFA and Advisory Committee on Diversity
- Fiscal Work Group
 - Commissioners and Executive Directors from:
 - Orange, Los Angeles and Kern Counties
 - Advisory Committee on Diversity Members
 - Packard, Foundation Consortium, TASC Representatives, CCFC Staff
- Program Work Group
 - Commissioners and Executive Directors from:
 - Santa Clara, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties
 - Advisory Committee on Diversity Members:
 - Packard, CA Endowment, TASC Representatives, CCFC Staff
- Evaluation Work Group
 - Commissioners and Executive Directors from:
 - Santa Barbara, Yuba, and Solano counties
 - Advisory Committee on Diversity Members
 - Foundation Consortium, TASC Representatives, CCFC Staff
- Technical Assistance Work Group
 - Commissioners and Executive Directors from
 - San Diego, Kings, and Monterey Counties
 - Advisory Committee on Diversity Members
 - Packard, Foundation Consortium, TASC Representatives, CCFC Staff

- CCFC School Readiness Initiative Builds on 3 Important Components from the NEGP definition of School Readiness
 - Ready Children
 - Ready Families and Communities
 - Ready Schools
- Accomplishments
 - Five essential and coordinated elements for school readiness
 - Early care and education
 - Parenting/Family support
 - Health and social services
 - School's readiness for children
 - Infrastructure, evaluation, and administration
 - Program
 - Develop the March 2001 'Discussion Paper' outlining purpose, research, and design of the School Readiness Initiative
 - SR-RFF released August 2001 and revised March 2002, to integrate the SR/Equity Principles
 - Coordinated Peer Reviews for Statewide Consistency (November 2001, February and June 2002) that build on extensive County Commission review.
 - CCFC, County Commissions, and local partners provide \$413M for 4-year launch
 - All 58 County Commissions invited and eager to participate
 - 67 SR Programs in process (represents 26 Counties)
 - Public Education
 - SR Edition of 'Building Blocks' newsletter
 - Presentations at CDE, CAEYC and DHS/MCH Statewide Conferences, and more
 - Plans for SR in Media, PR, and CBO Programs
 - Adopted 'First 5 California' as SR Identity
 - Evaluation
 - Contract with SRI, includes subcontracts with UCLA and CS&O
 - Regional evaluation meetings and two SR evaluation meetings
 - Technical Assistance
 - CCFC: Initial information meetings; Ongoing conference calls; Statewide conference; Consultation and presentations
 - UCLA Interagency Agreement for ToolKits, Listserv, Regional meetings, and consultation
 - TASC Resources and Consultation
 - County partner resources
- Target Communities for CCFC School Readiness Programs
 - Communities served by schools with Academic Performance Index (API) in deciles 1-3, estimate:

- 1,385 schools
 - About 800,000 children (0-5)
 - 85% low income
 - 45% English Language Learners
 - 75% Latino
- Challenges
 - Huge effort to start-up, especially coordination across 5 Essential and Coordinated Elements
 - Implementation of Equity Principles
 - Family engagement
 - Harvest and disseminate 'how to' information and promising practices
 - Coordination of program, evaluation, technical assistance and media efforts
- School Readiness Involves Many Partners
 - School Readiness Centers and Programs
 - Families and Community Residents
 - Governor and Legislature
 - Local Early Educators, Schools, and Partners
 - State and County Proposition 10 Commissions
- Why Invest in School Readiness?
 - California's children will be healthier and better prepared to reach their greatest potential in school and in life. (CCFC Vision)

Discussion:

Commissioner Vismara asked if there have been enough lessons learned here to begin considering taking a more proactive role in implementing public policy. Ms. Peck stated that more information on this idea will probably surface during part two of this presentation next Commission meeting.

Chairman Reiner stated that perhaps not all aspects of the School Readiness Initiative can be embraced policy-wise from a political perspective.

Commissioner Karen Hill-Scott asked if an analysis of organizational development was being conducted as part of the evaluation process. Jane Henderson stated that the evaluation does include process evaluation as well as outcomes evaluation.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that it would be a mistake to assess outcomes too early, when organization building is what is happening. A document on organization building could be useful in influencing public policy in the future.

Chairman Reiner acknowledged the work of and commended Jovanna Gonsalves. Jovanna was presented with a letter of appreciation for her work with the Commission as an Executive Fellow.

Agenda Item 9 – Master Plan Report on School Readiness

Jane Henderson made some opening remarks and introduced Judy Stucki. A summary of Judy's presentation follows.

Three big ideas from the School Readiness report were incorporated into the and open Master Plan's draft report:

- Preventive health screenings and assessments, as well as early intervention services and supports as needed (Reco 1)
- Neighbor-hood based School Readiness Centers that give families access to essential services to meet young children's developmental needs, including, to the greatest extent possible, school facilities where students and their families may access those services (Reco 2)
- Voluntary access to formal preschool programs that offer group experiences, developmentally appropriate curricula, and individualized transition plans to kindergarten. (Reco 3)
- Other ideas are combined with K-12 and Postsecondary recommendations.
 - Professional development
 - Children with disabilities and other special needs
- Items in the School Readiness Report that are not in the Master Plan draft:
 - Governance
 - Family Leave
 - Health and development "passports"
 - Incentives for employer/workplace family-friendly practices

Discussion:

Judy said she has asked that the family leave and incentives for employers recommendations be reconsidered by the Joint Committee for inclusion in the Master Plan.

Commissioner Belshé asked that the priority selection criteria be identified. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that there were no formal criteria used, but that with Commissioner Belshé's input more formal criteria could be developed.

Commissioner Hill-Scott presented the Master Plan Matrix for discussion.

Please refer to the Master Plan for Education – School Readiness Recommendation Discussion Matrix for the details of the presentation.

Chairman Reiner expressed his appreciation for all of the hard work that went into this project. Chairman Reiner stated that he sees many opportunities for action from this report. He stated that he is personally interested in legislating what can be legislated.

Commissioner Hill-Scott reminded the Commission that their mission is 0-5 not education in general.

Commissioner Belshé suggested using selected recommendations as priorities for the Commission and then assess what tools we have to address these priorities.

Commissioner Vismara asked that under the heading of preschool, “age appropriate curricula” be made to read “developmentally appropriate curricula”. Commissioner Vismara noted that the success of the overall program is dependent, in large part, on Professional Development in the context of children with disabilities and other special needs. Commissioner Vismara asked if the document will be utilized to engage parents and families in the process of teaching their children. He suggested that this be made more explicit in the document.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that the document was originally written for the Joint Committee and that rewriting the document for general use has been discussed.

Commissioner Chough suggested engaging parents who are participating in Cal Works. Commissioner Chough asked for clarification on the ‘passports’ issue. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that this issue required further development and invited Commissioner Chough to join in on this process.

Public Comment:

Ed Condit, California Head Start Association, suggested that the Commission could play a role in the Federal appropriations for Head Start. One in 10 Head Start children is in California. With respect to data collection, Head Start has been collecting data on children for 36 years. The various data should be woven together.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that the recommended data collection is modeled after the Head Start model.

Karen Blinstrub cautioned that the use of the word ‘passport’ is viewed as threatening in some of the communities she serves.

Nancy Strohl, Child Care Law Center, spoke in support of quality of services in the upcoming reform proposals.

Agenda Item 10 – Legislative Items

Patti Huston and Joe Munso presented this agenda item.

SB 1661 (Kuehl) – Paid Family and Medical Leave Insurance.

SB 1661 would establish, effective January 1, 2004, a family temporary disability insurance program to provide up to 12 weeks of paid leave to employees who are unable to work because of their own sickness or injury, or who take time off work to care for a sick or injured family member, or the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of a new child. The program would be implemented within the State Disability Insurance Program through additional employee contributions, and by requiring employers to provide benefits either directly, through private insurance, or by an election to contribute to the Disability Fund.

Position and requested action: The CCFC voted to support SB 1661 in April 2002. The Commission has now been requested by Senator Sheila Kuehl to join the California Labor Federation as a co-sponsor of SB 1661.

Discussion:

Chairman Reiner stated that this bill goes to a core issue. The bill would provide parents an opportunity to bond with their children in a critical developmental stage of the child's lives. Chairman Reiner asked what duties would befall the Commission if it were to co-sponsor the bill. Jane Henderson stated that this position is a notch up from taking a strong position of support and would allow the author to use the Commission's name in promoting the bill.

Commissioner Belshé asked if there were any other co-sponsors. Patti Huston informed the Commission that the Labor Federation is a sponsor of the bill, but the Commission would be the only co-sponsor.

Commissioner Vismara asked if there was a means test for this bill. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that such a condition is not inherent in administration of disability insurance programs.

Commissioner Belshé expressed concern over the Commission's advancing its goal of healthy children through very broad contexts. SDI funding of this bill is precedent setting and as such the Commission should take special care to be very clear about the implications of taking a position of co-sponsorship.

Patti Huston stated that discussions have indicated that the bill could result in total employer funding of the leave.

Commissioner Hill-Scott asked if co-sponsorship means that the Commission has the ability now to fashion changes in the bill.

Chairman Reiner reiterated his position that this bill speaks to the core of what the Commission is doing. Staff can state the Commission's recommendations to the author.

Public Comment:

Patty Siegel spoke in support of this bill.

Action by the Commission: The motion to approve Commission Co-sponsorship of SB 1661 passed unanimously with the provision that the Commission be involved in the bill's refinement process.

AB 1666 – The Commission was presented with information and then provided direction to staff on AB 1666 (Horton), a budget trailer bill that would create a new tobacco licensing program for tobacco manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, importers, and retailers, with the intent of addressing tobacco smuggling and black market cigarettes. As written, AB 1666 could have a fiscal impact to Prop 10 of several million dollars annually (Prop 99 would also be impacted), since Prop 10 and 99 funds could be used to reimburse the Board of Equalization for its administrative and enforcement costs of the licensing program. The licensing fees that tobacco manufacturers, etc. would be required to pay are for the most part “one-time” in nature, and although the goal would be for the program to be self-funded with the fees, it is not likely to remain fee-funded beyond the short-term. Because AB 1666 is a budget trailer bill, it will not have public hearings to discuss the policy or fiscal implications of the bill. However, amendments to the bill (or a clean up bill to follow it) are being negotiated and are changing quickly in an effort to keep the bill with the budget and the other trailer bills. To allow CCFC to weigh in, the Commission provided direction to staff as follows:

- 1) Authorized staff to get involved in negotiations of amendments to AB 1666, or whatever bill ultimately moves forward. Since language is changing quickly and negotiations are ongoing, authorized staff to negotiate within some or all of the following parameters:
 - i. Current Prop. 10 revenues cannot be tapped for the new functions of the licensing program. That is, only Prop. 10 revenues generated as a result of the new activities can be used to fund the new activities.
 - ii. Any funding formula should take only a proportional percentage – that is, Prop. 10 should fund only 36 percent of the BOE activities (with Prop. 99 having a smaller percentage, and the General Fund having a larger share).

- iii. Insist on “intent” language, at the least, that the new enforcement activities should generate more than enough new revenues to pay for themselves (calculated/confirmed through an audit).
- 2) Authorized staff to oppose, or secure more favorable amendments to, any bill that may materialize during the remainder of the legislative session that does not provide anti-preemption of local laws.
- 3) Authorized staff to oppose any bill for which the fiscal impact to Prop. 10 is uncertain or clearly negative.

Agenda Item 11 – Public Education Campaign Update

Nicole Kasabian and Roy Behr presented this agenda item. An outline of the presentation follows.

- New ad campaign began on July 1st, 2002
 - A representative sample of the ads was presented to the Commission.
 - In the first 16 days the ads generated 22,500 phone calls
 - Doubled the number of previous English calls
 - Four times the number of previous Spanish calls
 - Next phase of the campaign
 - Research
 - Focus groups
 - English
 - Spanish
 - Goals
 - Perception of school readiness
 - Opinions on elements of school readiness program
 - How to be most persuasive
 - Challenges
 - School readiness is an ineffective name
 - School readiness is not on the top ten list of the public when they are asked how California could be improved over the next ten years.
 - Parents feel strongly that the early years are the purview of the parents and not government.
 - Negative perception of K-12 system
 - Opportunities
 - The message has gotten out about the connection between the early years and the later years.
 - People are open to the notion of starting school earlier in life.

- Findings
 - Draw the link between K-12 and the early years more closely
 - Described a potential school readiness program
 - No clear funding source
 - Public ranking of seven most important elements of the program
 - Make sure that all children have access to quality nursery school, preschool or pre K programs to help children develop the skills they need to learn their potential when they get to kindergarten.
 - Make sure that all children in California have access to good pediatric care so that the health needs essential to learning are being met.
 - Make sure all pregnant women have access to quality prenatal care and have good information on how to care for themselves while they are expecting.
 - Make sure that all children, including the children of single parents, have access to good quality child care programs.
 - Make sure parents have access to information and advice about children's brain development and what they can do as parents to help their children learn and grow to their full potential.
 - Make sure that children's basic nutritional needs are being met and parents have access to advice and information about nutrition.
 - Make sure there are appropriate parental leave policies in place to give working parents a greater opportunity to be involved in their children's development.
- Next steps
 - Written report for the Commission
 - Develop a statewide survey on how to develop an ad campaign that can begin to engage the public in this issue.
 - Proceed to ad development and testing with the goal of having new ads on the air by the end of this year.

Ben Austin added that there have been discussions about how embracing particular policy initiatives will define 'First 5 California' as a public entity, how that impacts the Commission strategically, and how it will affect the public perception.

Discussion:

Commissioner Hill-Scott suggested that the Commission begin thinking about packaging what the Commission does on this issue in language that resonates with the people it is trying to reach. Language should convey that the goal is not school readiness; the goal is fulfilling your child's potential. This would empower parents and allow them to become more engaged.

Chairman Reiner stated that the Commission should engage the public on policies that will eventually develop an early care and education system.

Commissioner Vismara spoke in support of building public trust over building public will. Commissioner Vismara expressed concern over linking higher education to 1 and 2 year olds when the majority of the target audience has not attended college. Commissioner Vismara expressed concern over the absence of ads addressing children with disabilities and other special needs.

Ben Austin stated that in order to build public will in this area, the issues that the Commission puts forth must be viewed in the context of the following questions:

- Does the public understand and identify with these issues?
- Are we bringing along a large portion of the general public as we move forward?
- Are these the issues that the Commission wants to define itself with?

Commissioner Hill-Scott spoke in support of making the disabilities issue visible in the campaign, including the spots that were previously shown.

Nicole Kasabian stated that the issue of disabilities has always been addressed in each phase of the ad campaign.

Jane Henderson stated that staff has been aware that this is an issue and is looking for direction on this issue.

Commissioner Belshé reiterated the importance of focusing on one or two principal policy priorities that help define the Commission and this issue.

Chairman Reiner reiterated the need for gaining public will with respect to sustaining the work of the Commission beyond that possible through the current funding stream.

Public Comment:

Mark Friedman, Alameda CFC, emphasized the need to ensure the positive link between the service providers and the child.

Cheri Schoenborn, State Department of Developmental Services, Early Start Program, stated that she was impressed with the quality of the ads and that there should be ads with children with disabilities. Ms. Schoenborn asked what was available to the parent when they call for the kit.

Karen Blinstrub stated that some of the language in the questionnaires is foreign to the target population. There is a difference between a focus group and civic engagement. The role of the Commission is not only to get the information out there, but to engage the civic entities and political will.

Agenda Item 12 – Focus Area of Informal Child Care

Emily Nahat introduced the next three items on Focus Areas. Emily indicated that the Commissioners would identify two common elements in the Focus Area options. One is demonstration/innovative projects. The intent of funding activities in the Focus Areas is to strengthen the practice in that area within the context of a more comprehensive, community-based program: the School Readiness programs. Therefore, these demonstration sites will generally be part of a School Readiness program. However, there are many details surrounding the demonstration sites to be worked out with CCAFA over the next few months. The second common element is a statewide coordination entity. While the entity in each Focus Area will have some distinct tasks, they will all provide intensive support to the demonstration sites in that Focus Area and document/disseminate promising practices among all counties. These entities will provide a qualified cadre of specialists to provide technical assistance in the Commission's Focus Areas.

Sarah Neville-Morgan presented the agenda item on Informal Child Care.

This is a second opportunity to discuss funding options to strengthen CCFC's School Readiness Initiative by providing supports to informal child-caregivers. Options include matching funds to County Commissions for demonstration sites to target informal child-caregivers in communities served by School Readiness programs. Other strategies will provide education/supports to subsidized and non-subsidized informal child-caregivers statewide. Input during and following the May Commission meeting has resulted in further refinement of the project goals and funding options as described in this paper.

Discussion:

Commissioner Belshé asked how many demonstration projects would be supported. Sarah Neville-Morgan informed the Commission that it would be between 5 and 10 projects. Commissioner Belshe stated that if the goal of doing demonstration projects is to try to influence the policy debate in Sacramento to affect change that will assist communities more broadly, then the question follows, is it best to fund 10 different models to see what success looks like or do you go into it with some general understanding of what a potential model is and you fund one very well in an urban community and one very well in a rural community which is then evaluated.

Commissioner Chough stated that the problems that surround informal child care must be more clearly identified. Ms. Neville-Morgan stated that some of these questions are addressed in the proposal, but were skipped over in consideration of time constraints. Commissioner Chough stated that the demonstration sites proposal seems very broad. Ms. Neville-Morgan stated that focus groups will help narrow this down.

Jane Henderson stated that one model being considered is one with subsidized providers and asked if Commissioner Gutierrez's suggestion of non-subsidized providers should be considered as another model.

Commissioner Hill-Scott suggested considering a different strategy. There should be funding for a planning period that helps define how and what should be done. Phase one should include experts from throughout the state who have been working with informal care providers and focus groups that include informal care providers. Phase 2 would propose demonstrations with priorities that come out of phase one. Ms. Neville-Morgan stated that the coordinating entity would do the focus groups and help with the demonstration sites.

Public Comment:

Patty Siegel, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, spoke in support of the positive changes to this draft of the document. Ms. Siegel suggested that the goal of looking at informal care as a part of a continuum of care that leads to more formal licensed care be added to the document. Ms. Siegel spoke in support of a planning group. Ms. Siegel cautioned that the 48 hr training requirement is too much as a pre-service requirement.

Agenda Item 13 – Focus Area of Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs

Emily Nahat presented this discussion item. An outline of the presentation follows. Ms. Nahat acknowledged Commissioners Vismara and Gutierrez and all of the staff who have worked in this area for all of their efforts.

- **Background/ History**
 - Advisory Committee on Diversity
 - Adopted Equity Principles
 - Adopted definition of children with disabilities and other special needs
 - *Barriers to Inclusive Child Care* (WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention, 2001)
 - *Investments to Create Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs* (The California Institute on Human Services, Sonoma State University, 2002)
 - Strategic planning process
 - Reports.
- **Project Goals**
 - Develop and model practices that demonstrate a commitment to providing quality services and supports for children with disabilities and other special needs and their families, in all aspects of development: planning, program design, implementation and evaluation.
 - Work with families, educators, and health and social service providers to better meet the needs of young children with disabilities and other special needs in the context of a broad community approach, including the School Readiness Initiative.
 - Emphasize results and achieve social and emotional developmental goals of children with disabilities and other special needs in all settings.
- **Overview**
 - **Statewide Coordination Entity**
 - **A. Develop desired outcomes.**
 - Develop specific results for children and families, and improvements in systems to be achieved through the project (in conjunction with the School Readiness Initiative evaluation).
 - **B. Develop the demonstration site project.**
 - Develop selection criteria, and program design elements consistent with Principles on Equity, in furtherance of Master Plan recommendations (e. g., screening/assessment, inclusive services, training) and the School Readiness Initiative.

- **C. Coordinate demonstration site network.**
 - Coordinate and facilitate communication and information sharing among the demonstration sites and local partners (see Recommendation II).
- **D. Provide training and technical assistance.**
 - Facilitate a planning process with demonstration sites and key partners
 - (see Recommendation II) .
 - Provide direct training and technical assistance services to demonstration sites.
 - Provide technical assistance to Prop. 10 School Readiness Initiative (SRI) programs and affiliated local service providers.
 - Incorporate existing training opportunities sponsored by other entities to the extent possible.
- **E. Disseminate effective practices.**
 - Document and broadly disseminate (in user- friendly formats) promising and effective practices and resources from national, state and local sources and those emerging from the demonstration sites and SRI programs.
- **F. Improve systems.**
 - Gain support and implement systems improvements in conjunction with statewide leadership forums such as the Map to Inclusive Child Care and the Early Start Interagency Coordinating Council.
- **G. Build/ support regional infrastructure to expand the supply of trained providers.**
 - Facilitate and support the establishment of agreements among community colleges, universities, and other training institutions to provide high quality training on the subject of inclusion and systems improvements for administrators; early childhood educators; health, social services and specialized service providers; and families.
- **H. Identify quality education materials for parents and providers.**
 - Coordinate with demonstration sites, state agencies, community advocacy groups and others currently producing materials on inclusion for young children with disabilities to select, produce and disseminate written materials and multimedia information at appropriate literacy levels, and in multiple languages.

- **I. Provide consultation to CCFC staff.**
 - Provide research and technical support to CCFC staff in support of children with disabilities and other special needs.
- **II. Demonstration Sites**
 - **A. Demonstration site selection**
 - Develop and release a Request for Funding (RFF) with incentive funds (with a local match requirement) to support First Five California Inclusion Resource Demonstration Sites that include resource teams and other services at approximately 5 School Readiness Initiative programs.
 - **B. Independent program evaluation**
 - Fund a multi- year independent evaluation of the First Five California Inclusion Resource Demonstration Sites, conducted in conjunction with the School Readiness Initiative evaluation.
- **III. Public Education**
 - CCFC to enhance targeted messages for parents of children with disabilities or who may be at risk for disabilities (e. g. , stressing screening/assessment)
 - Ensure that messages and images are inclusive of children with disabilities and other special needs.
- **Next Steps**
 - **Staff is requesting direction from the State Commissioners in the following areas:**
 - Options to be pursued, including priorities and timing
 - Funding amounts
 - County- level participation
 - Discussion paper (September 2002)
 - Funding and proposal for action (October 2002)

Discussion:

Chairman Reiner asked for a sense of the required funding level. Ms. Nahat stated that staff is considering a very limited number of demonstration sites. Commissioner Vismara stated that it is important to develop a model that is replicable and can be applied throughout the state. In order to achieve that model, which does not currently exist, the network would require \$1-\$1.5M. This is a step approach.

Jane Henderson stated that staff will present more on budget issues in September when there is more information available on revenue forecasting.

Commissioner Belshé stated that she recalled \$5-\$6M per focus area.

Commissioner Belshé stated all three focus areas seem overly ambitious and expressed concern over the mechanics of the process.

Commissioner Vismara stated that he believes that some of the aforementioned activities are already being funded by state and federal legislation.

Agenda Item 14 -- Focus Area of Oral Health

Barbara Marquez presented this discussion item. An outline of the presentation follows.

- Goal
 - The program will be designed to specifically address and enhance:
 - Provider supply, distribution, and qualifications
 - Parent and community understanding of the importance of oral health for young children
 - Research and evaluation efforts in the area
- Background/History
 - Feedback was incorporated from CCFC briefing
 - Additional input solicited from County Commission representatives, MRMIB, DHS and others
 - Further review of the literature
 - Comparable programs reviewed
 - CCFC work load was taken under consideration
 - Strived to design and deliver several components into a coordinated and integrated program
- Options – Need Area One
 - 1. Statewide Training Program in coordination with County Commissions
 - A statewide entity or consortium to develop and conduct the Statewide Training Program.
 - Standardized training curriculum, materials, and other tools.
 - Coordinate with County Commission locally to support the trainings.
 - Evaluation of the training program.

- Timeframe:
 - Year 1: Planning and Development
 - Year 2-5: Implementation Evaluation
 - Estimated Cost: \$1.5M annually for 5 years (less funding may be needed during Year 1)
- 2. School Readiness Oral Health Demonstration Projects
 - a. County-based demonstration projects
 - Integral component of School Readiness Program
 - Support the development of promising and innovative strategies
 - Provide for needed flexibility at the local level
 - Comprehensive in nature. Must address both service and system changes and have an evaluation component
 - Timeframe:
 - Year 1: Planning and Development
 - Year 2-5: Implementation and Evaluation
 - Estimated Cost: \$1M annually for up to 4 years
 - b. Insurance-based demonstration projects
 - In partnership with another state agency (MRMIB), CCFC could also develop and evaluate strategies proposed by dental health plans and networks of Healthy Families providers.
 - There is a possibility of being able to leverage Proposition 10 funds with matching federal government dollars (\$2 for every \$1 of Proposition 10 funds).
 - Could include one or more of the following components:
 - Provider recruitment and retention projects, especially in rural and underserved areas
 - Provision of mobile dental services in targeted areas
 - Apprenticeships for general dentists willing to acquire skills in treating young children

- Rate enhancements and incentives
 - Telehealth/telemedicine networks
 - Timeframe:
 - Year 1: Planning and Development with statewide entity
 - Year 2-5: Implementation and Evaluation
 - Estimated Cost: \$1M annually for 4 years
- 3. Policy/Advocacy:
 - Promote policy changes that would expand the scope of providers to allow dental auxiliaries to provide additional preventive services.
 - CCFC could:
 - Closely monitor the progress of this action and offer its support and assistance as needed.
 - Also lend its support to resolving the ambiguities in medical and dental practice acts to make it clear that medical professionals can legally provide preventive dental services.
 - Work closely with both the Dental Board of California and the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.
- Options – Need Area Two
 - B. Improve the understanding and education of parents, families, and community service providers about the importance of early oral health care for their young children.
 - Public Education Campaign
 - Focus its message on oral health promotion and disease prevention in culturally competent and linguistically appropriate venues.
 - Promote messages in several languages or targeted to specific population groups at greatest risk for dental disease.
 - Media Campaign
 - CBO Community Outreach Program
 - Child Care Health Linkages Project
 - Oral Health Videos
 - Kit for New Parents
 - Carefully assess, update and enhance oral health information as needed.

- Timeframe: Years 1-5: Ongoing review and reassessment
 - C. Inadequate baseline data. Limited population-based oral health data is available about the Proposition 10 population in California.
 - Conduct focused, population-based studies to provide an understanding of the current California environment, and serve as a basis for comparison over time.
 - To be done concurrently with program implementation, three surveys are proposed:
 - Parents of children aged 0-5 and pregnant/birthing women
 - Dentists
 - Community service providers
 - Timeframe:
 - Year 1: Planning and development
 - Years 2-3: Survey, Analysis and Reporting
 - Estimated cost: \$1M (total)
- Recommendations – Implementation Plan
 - The proposed implementation plan consists of the following steps
 - Issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to procure the services of a Statewide Oral Health Coordinator. This entity or consortium (private or public) would be responsible for the following tasks:
 - Develop a Statewide Training Program in coordination with County Commissions
 - Provide Statewide Technical Assistance and Resource Services
 - Material Development
 - Research and Evaluation
 - Implement School Readiness Oral Health Demonstration Projects in conjunction with County Commissions to test innovative local approaches and implement with statewide entities to test insurance-based coverage models.
 - Assist, monitor and report on the progress made towards expanding the scope of practice (e.g., preventive oral health practices for young children) for dental auxiliaries and medical providers.

- Direction Needed
 - Role for CCFC
 - Options and recommendation described in the paper
 - Timeframe
 - Funding amounts

Discussion:

Chairman Reiner asked for cost information. Barbara Marquez stated that the proposal would cost approximately \$5 M annually for five years.

Commissioner Belshé stated that these programs need time to get up and running to be properly evaluated.

Chairman Reiner asked how media outreach should be conducted on this issue. Barbara Marquez stated that staff needs to evaluate what is currently being done in this area.

Commissioner Vismara asked for the size of the DentiCal budget. The Commission was informed that the DentiCal budget is \$850M (inclusive of services to both serves to children and adults.)

Commissioner Belshé acknowledged the efforts of those involved with this issue.

Public Comment:

Laura Roberts, Lassen County CFC, emphasized the need for the training aspect of this proposal.

Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services, stated that her department's wellness initiative has been working with UOP School of Dentistry to develop a brochure about oral health care for children with disabilities. Ms. Schoenborn requested that DDS be a partner on this issue.

Bob Isman, Department of Health Services, acknowledged the hard work of those who worked on this proposal. Dr. Isman emphasized that dental professionals typically don't see children until they are 3 or 4 years old, and as such, pediatricians must also be trained to recognize oral health problems. Dr. Isman emphasized the need to evaluate media materials before launching a massive campaign. Dr. Isman stated that needs assessments should include oral examinations.

John Roth, California Dental Association Foundation, stated that training and media messages should have a referral source built in.

Gene Casagrande, Los Angeles Oral Health Foundation, stated that his foundation has presented an oral health proposal to Los Angeles County Children & Families Commission. Mr. Casagrande expressed concern over the lack of fluoridation in the latest proposal. In terms of needs assessment, the lack of resources needs to be clearly identified. LA County has a severe service shortage at this time.

Shaundra Miller, California Association of Public Hospitals, offered some suggestions to the Commission in written form. Please refer to written comments for details.

Larry Platt, Dental Health Foundation, offered words of appreciation to the Commission. Dr. Platt suggested that the demonstration projects be done in such a way as to be able to make templates from the projects to share with others and to provide an experience basis for policy change. Standards should be developed for any needs assessment. A statewide needs assessment should be considered.

Gloria Bryngelson, San Diego CFC, stated that her commission has invested over \$4M in oral health and despite their investments, dental caries continues to be a prevalent health issue for children 0-5 in San Diego County.

The Council of Community Clinics formally supports this initiative.

Agenda Item 15 – Adjournment

Action by Commission: The motion to approve was seconded and passed by vote without dissent.